



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,846	12/09/2003	Shailesh B. Gandhi	BOC9-2003-0082 (450)	5224

40987 7590 04/22/2005

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2644

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,846

Applicant(s)

GANDHI ET AL.

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date April 05, 2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 11-14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Azami et al [US 20020076020 A1].

Regarding claim 1, Azami et al teach a method for handling an off-hook event shown in Figs. 22 and 23, comprising the steps of:

detecting an off-hook event (113) with a modem (131) communicatively linked to a circuit loop between a PSTN network (101) and a telephone (102), in which the off-hook event occurs, wherein the detection is based on audible information (i.e. voice signal) conveyed by the circuit loop;

initiating at least one programmatic action within a computing device (i.e. CPU 103) communicatively linked to the modem (103); and conveying an off-hook notification to the personal computer (108) (DPD) as a result of the programmatic action [Figs. 22, 23; Para: 0228; 0214-224].

Regarding claim 2, Azamai et al further teach the method comprising the step of:

Art Unit: 2644

receiving an information tone (i.e. detecting ringer (118)), wherein the information tone (i.e. ringer) is generated by a central Office (not shown) and transmitted via the telephone line of the PSTN (101), to indicate that an off-hook event has occurred [Figs. 22, 23].

Regarding claim 3, Azamai et al further teach the method comprising the step of: determining whether a dial-tone is present (i.e. detecting ringer (118)); checking the circuit loop for audible information (i.e. voice signal); and based on the checking step and upon a previously established time-out threshold (i.e. a predetermined time) , determining that the off-hook event has occurred [Figs. 22, 23; Para: 0217; 0224-0225].

Regarding claim 4, Azamai et al further teach the method, wherein the off-hook notification includes a speech message, identifying a previously recorded speech message stored within the computing device (i.e. CPU 103) [Figs. 4-6; Para: 0096; 0129; 0238].

Regarding claim 11, Azami et al teach a machine-readable (i.e. computer-readable) storage having stored thereon, a computer program having a plurality of code sections, the code sections executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the following steps:

detecting an off-hook event (113) with a modem (131) communicatively linked to a circuit loop between a PSTN network (101) and a telephone (102), in which the off-hook event occurs , wherein the detection is based on audible information (i.e. voice signal) conveyed by the circuit loop;

initiating at least one programmatic action within a computing device (i.e. CPU 103) communicatively linked to the modem (103); and conveying an off-hook notification to the personal computer (108) (DPD) as a result of the programmatic action [Figs. 22, 23; Para: 0228; 0214-224; Fig. 7; Para: 0002; 0015-0016; 0059; 0062-0063; 0072-0093; Fig. 10; Para: 0119-0125; claims 24-36].

Regarding claims 12-14, the limitations are shown above.

Regarding claim 21, Azami et al teach a system for handling an off-hook event shown in Figs. 22 and 23, comprising the steps of:

means (113) detecting an off-hook event with a modem (131) communicatively linked to a circuit loop between a PSTN network (101) and a telephone (102), in which the off-hook event occurs , wherein the detection is based on audible information (i.e. voice signal) conveyed by the circuit loop;

means (CPU 103) for initiating at least one programmatic action within a computing device (i.e. CPU 103) communicatively linked to the modem (103); and

means (107) for conveying an off-hook notification to the personal computer (108) (DPD) as a result of the programmatic action [Figs. 22, 23; Para: 0228; 0214-224].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-6, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azami et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Luneau et al [US 20030128821 A1].

Regarding claim 5, Azami et al do not teach expressly identifying (i.e. displaying) a text-based notification and text-to-speech converting the text-based notification to generate a speech message.

Luneau et al teach a method for identifying (i.e. displaying) a text-based notification [Fig. 1; Para: 0017]; and

text-to-speech converting the text-based notification to generate a speech message [Para: 0057].

Art Unit: 2644

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the speech message method of Lineau et al with Azami et al in order to facilitate natural interactions with users [Lineau et al; Para: 0004; 0007].

Regarding claim 6, Lineau et al teach the method comprising the step of playing an audible message using at least one speaker (30) [Para: 0018].

Regarding claims 15-16, the limitations are shown above.

5. Claims 7-8, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azami et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Farris et al [US 20020163999 A1].

Regarding claims 7-8, Azami et al do not teach expressly a network connection with another computing device.

Farris et al teach a network connection with another computing device [Para: 0111; 0150] including an electronic message across the network connection [Figs. 1-2; Para: 0102; 0117; 0144; 0195; 0289].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of electronic messaging across the network

Art Unit: 2644

connection of Farris et al with Azami et al in order to provide personal communication services [Farris et al; Para: 0051].

Regarding claims 17-18, the limitations are shown above.

6. Claims 9-10, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azami et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Caharel et al [US 20030021393 A1].

Regarding claim 9, Azami et al do not teach expressly establishing a wireless connection with another a mobile service.

Caharel et al teach establishing a wireless connection with another a mobile service (i.e. mobile radiotelephone) [Para: 0003; 0005; 0025; 0030-0032; 0035; 0051-0052].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use electronic messaging across the network connection of Caharel et al with Azamin et al in order to communicate quickly with another user [Caharel et al; Para: 0008].

Art Unit: 2644

Regarding claim 10, Caharel et al teach that the electronic message includes a speech message (i.e. voice mail services) [Para: 0032].

Regarding claims 19-20, the limitations are shown above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Sinh can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2644
SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

